



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/339,325	06/23/1999	YOAV SHOHAM	003660.P001X	2458

7590 09/16/2002

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
7TH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

YOUNG, JOHN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/339,325

Applicant(s)  
Shoham et al.

Examiner  
John Young

Art Unit  
3622



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John Young

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Andre Gibbs

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Aug 28, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1,

Identification of prior art discussed:

Halbert US 6,101,484

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's representative proffered that the Halbert reference fails to either disclose or suggest or provide motivation for the "bid transformer" element of claim 1. The Examiner contends that based on the breadth of the claim language, the interpretation of the claim can not support some of the narrower features found in the specification. The Examiner suggested possibly narrowing the claim. The Examiner also contends that there is in fact motivation and suggestion in the applied references and pointed out where (even though the suggestion and motivation may not be the same as that of the instant invention. The Examiner suggested further options such as and RCE with amendments and further arguments or appeal.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required